Original Research Article

The Role of Knowledge Management in Making Administrative Decisions

Prof. Dr. Obaid Mahmmood Mohsin Al Zawbaee[1*], Dr. Hamdi Ismail Ahmad[1], Dr. Hamid Jihad Dulaimi Alkubaisi[1]

[1]Al-Siraj Private University, Fallujah, Iraq

Abstract: Knowledge management is considered one of the strategic tools in modern organizations as it contributes to improving performance, increasing competitiveness, improving planning processes, and identifying opportunities and risks, which enables the organization to respond quickly to changes and make flexible and innovative decisions. The impact of knowledge management on administrative decision-making is that knowledge management plays a fundamental role in improving the quality and efficiency of decisions. Our research aimed to identify performance trends related to knowledge management processes and decision-making processes, as well as to identify knowledge management elements and variables that affect decision-making and arrange them according to their importance and exclude unimportant variables by building an efficient statistical model. The application was carried out on a sample of (100) observations, from which data was collected by means of a questionnaire prepared for this purpose, and the analysis was carried out in two directions: the first is descriptive by applying Likert scale to know the sample's trends, and the second is analytical by building a binary logistic model that includes, in addition to the dependent variable, five independent variables with a significant impact and (11) independent variables with a non-significant impact, as the model that was built has the ability to correctly classify by (91%).

Keywords: Knowledge management, decision-making, binary logistic model, Likert scale.

1. INTRODUCTION

Knowledge management is considered an important strategic tool in modern organizations, as it contributes to improving performance and increasing competitiveness by investing available intellectual and cognitive resources. The process of administrative decision-making depends largely on the quality of available information and knowledge. The importance of knowledge management in this context comes from its ability to collect, organize and distribute knowledge among employees in the organization, which helps reduce knowledge gaps and enhance communication that supports managers in making informed and effective decisions, which contributes to achieving the organization's goals more efficiently. In the current business environment characterized by complexity and rapid change, knowledge is one of the critical factors for success. Knowledge management contributes to improving analysis and planning processes and identifying opportunities and risks, which enables the organization to respond quickly to changes and make flexible and innovative decisions [2, 9, 12].

The impact of knowledge management on administrative decision-making is that knowledge management plays a fundamental role in improving the quality and efficiency of decisions. Through the availability of accurate information and appropriate knowledge at the right time.

The administrative decision-making process depends largely on the knowledge available to managers, whether that knowledge is derived from previous experiences, information obtained from information systems, or cooperation between members of the organization. Knowledge management ensures that this knowledge is available, up-to-date, and easily retrievable, which reduces the likelihood of making ill-considered decisions or decisions based on insufficient information [5, 7, 14].

In addition, knowledge management can contribute to reducing repetition in decision-making and problem-solving by enhancing the sharing of acquired knowledge across the organization, which increases the effectiveness of decisions and supports continuous innovation.

---

*Corresponding Author: Prof. Dr. Obaid Mahmmood Mohsin Al Zawbaee
Al-Siraj Private University, Fallujah, Iraq

Knowledge management receives greater attention in advanced societies and there is concern about how to exploit and distribute it, while this interest is less in developing societies where many institutions still suffer from the difficulty of scientifically and practically linking knowledge management to the decision-making process in defining the problem, developing alternatives and criteria for solving it, testing the best alternative, and then implementing the alternative that was tested [11].

Our research came within the framework of seeking to achieve identification of the impact of knowledge management on administrative decision-making by identifying the impact of acquiring and documenting knowledge and its impact on administrative decision-making. The research problem is that many institutions have difficulty in making effective administrative decisions due to lack of knowledge or misuse. The research asks: To what extent does the availability, organization and proper use of knowledge affect the administrative decision-making process? What are the factors that contribute to improving or hindering this impact?

The importance of the research comes from improving the quality of decisions and enhancing innovation and development that leads to increasing organizational efficiency, facilitating cooperation and communication, and improving competitiveness.

The aim of the research was to identify the trends of opinions regarding knowledge management and decision-making processes, as well as to identify knowledge management variables that affect decision-making and arrange them according to their importance and exclude unimportant variables.

The research was based on hypotheses that it is possible to determine the trends of the respondents' answers regarding knowledge management processes as well as regarding administrative decision-making, in addition to the importance of the model's parameters that will be built and that predicts the probability of the decision.

The research topic was addressed in several studies and research, some of which we mention:

The study (2024) aimed to show that the steady increase in the volume of information has led to the creation of increasing challenges for the management of this growing tide of information, whether at the internal level of the institution or at the external level, with which information technologies have provided tremendous potential for institutions to innovate new ways to manage this content and maximize its benefit, by organizing data, identifying features, relationships and organizational maps that reflect the integrated scene of work within the institution. In this study, the researcher conducted a large-scale systematic review of aspects of the field of smart content management operations in the context of

institutions, as the scientific review aims to review and analyze relevant scientific studies to extrapolate strengths and shortcomings in objective coverage, and then monitor knowledge gaps in the frameworks of intellectual production related to the subject of the study and determine a future research agenda [15].

The study (2024) aimed to identify the effectiveness of the active thinking model in a social context (TASC) in developing the depth of historical knowledge and cognitive curiosity among secondary school students. The research group consisted of two groups, numbering (50) students, which were divided into a control group and an experimental group. The research tools were applied pre-test (the depth of historical knowledge test - the cognitive curiosity scale), then the unit was taught according to the model to the students of the research group, then the research tools were applied post-test. The research results concluded that there is an effectiveness of the active thinking model in a social context (TASC) in developing the depth of historical knowledge and cognitive curiosity among secondary school students. Considering a set of recommendations and proposed research were developed [3].

The study (2023) aimed to identify the mechanisms for implementing an approach to school-centered reform in the State of Kuwait and how to transform this into a tangible practical reality, by clarifying the role of school-centered reform, identifying the most important basic features of the school-centered reform approach, and the most important requirements necessary for school administration in the State of Kuwait in light of school-centered reform. To achieve this goal, the researcher used the descriptive analytical approach to suit the research topic, as the researcher presented a set of methodological steps that include presenting the philosophy, goals, foundations, requirements, starting points and mechanisms for achieving this. The results of the study concluded that the school-centered reform approach is based on intellectual educational directives that make this approach the most appropriate for the requirements of educational reform at the present time, considering it the real application of the principal of decentralization of school administration. The results of the study also concluded that the most important mechanisms for activating an approach to school-centered reform in the State of Kuwait are building the school's vision and mission, and meeting the needs related to the professional development of workers. And activate the participation of the local community to meet the needs of students [8].

This study (2023) came to investigate the relationship between administrative decision-making in universities operating in the State of Kuwait and the reality of funding for each of them through the perspective - perceptions - of their employees. To achieve its objectives, the study adhered to the

descriptive analytical approach, which studies the correlation between the two variables under study and chose the quantitative approach to measure the correlation between the two study variables. The study sample was selected according to the available sample method, and the size of the study sample amounted to (218) workers in Kuwaiti universities [10].

2. Theoretical Framework:

Knowledge is the sum of ideas, information and understanding that a person acquires through learning and experience. The knowledge pyramid, according to the hierarchical perspective, consists of data, information and knowledge. Understanding information leads us to knowledge, and the accumulation of knowledge leads us to wisdom. Wisdom is the maturation of experience, its repetition and the accumulation of life experiences over time. Skills are manual and mental dexterity, and various abilities. Attitude is the behavior that characterizes an individual in specific situations and that arises from the basic assumptions, worships and values that he believes in.

Knowledge management is the process of organizing and exploiting the available knowledge within an institution or organization to achieve its goals more efficiently and effectively. Knowledge management aims to collect available knowledge, whether implicit (from personal experiences and daily interaction) or explicit (found in documents and data), store, distribute, and exchange it between individuals. The basic elements of knowledge management are: identifying, collecting, storing, sharing, applying, and developing knowledge. Knowledge management is of great importance in various institutions, including higher education and health institutions. The most prominent benefits of knowledge management are: improving decision-making, increasing efficiency, enhancing innovation, improving work quality, continuing education, preserving organizational knowledge, reducing repetition and time waste, storing knowledge, and collecting and sharing knowledge [1, 6, 10].

Knowledge management processes consist of a set of activities that aim to create, store, distribute, and use knowledge within organizations. These processes are vital to improving performance and innovation within organizations. These processes work to build a strong knowledge management system that aims to improve the organization's competitiveness and enhance its ability to adapt to continuous changes in the surrounding environment.

The concept of administrative decisions refers to the process through which individuals or teams in organizations choose certain options from among a set of available alternatives. Administrative decisions are an essential element in the management of organizations, as they directly affect the performance and overall success of the organization. The steps to solve any problem, which include the decision-making process, are represented by identifying the problem, determining a set of solutions and a set of alternatives, evaluating them, and choosing the best alternative. Administrative decisions are multiple, and each type of these decisions requires different methods in making and analyzing them.

Decision-making is one of the most important administrative functions that directly affects the success of institutions in various fields. It represents the basis on which strategies are built and through which future paths are determined. The effectiveness of this process is not limited to the speed of decision-making only but also includes the ability to choose the most appropriate alternatives based on accurate information and comprehensive analysis. In contexts such as higher education and healthcare, the importance of making informed decisions is even more prominent, as they directly affect institutional performance and the well-being of individuals [3, 6, 9].

Many statistical techniques are used to address such cases, and we will briefly refer to two methods: The first is considered a means of descriptive analysis, represented by the application of the five-point Likert scale, through which the trends of the respondents' opinions towards the phenomenon under study can be determined, as we will note in detail in the practical aspect of the research. The second method is the logistic regression analysis technique, which is considered a means of inferential analysis, through which we can identify the factors that significantly affect the dependent variable and rank them from most important to most important in terms of their influence, as well as exclude the variables with an insignificant impact on the dependent variable. This is done by building an effective statistical model in predicting the probability of the occurrence of the dependent variable [4].

3. The Practical Aspect:
3.1. Research data:

A questionnaire created specifically for this purpose (Appendix No. (1)) was used to gather the study data, which represents the thoughts of a sample of 100 people. Two lines of analysis were conducted:

The first is the descriptive direction by adopting the five-point Likert scale in order to know the directions and percentages of the sample's answers, where strongly agree = 5, agree = 4, neutral = 3, disagree = 2, strongly disagree = 1, and thus the average ranges are as in the following table:

Table 1: Likert averages

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1-1.8	1.81-2.6	2.61-3.4	3.41-4.2	4.21-5

By tabulating the data and sorting and collecting the answers according to the Likert scale, the averages and percentages were found, as shown in the following Table (2).

Table 2: Likert results regarding knowledge elements

No.	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 I do not know	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree	Average	Deviation	Percentage 100 %	T TEST	Sample direction	Question Rank
1	0	0	4	21	75	4.71	29.25	94.20	0.43	**Strongly Agree**	**1**
2	1	0	0	31	68	4.65	27.50	93.00	0.44	**Strongly Agree**	**2**
4	0	3	6	39	52	4.40	22.24	88.00	0.47	**Strongly Agree**	**3**
12	1	1	5	46	47	4.37	22.61	87.40	0.45	**Strongly Agree**	**4**
14	2	0	3	50	45	4.36	23.42	87.20	0.43	**Strongly Agree**	**5**
10	1	2	7	43	47	4.33	21.52	86.60	0.46	**Strongly Agree**	**6**
11	0	1	8	50	41	4.31	22.14	86.20	0.44	**Strongly Agree**	**7**
3	0	0	13	50	37	4.24	21.19	84.80	0.43	**Strongly Agree**	**8**
8	0	1	5	63	31	4.24	25.15	84.80	0.37	**Strongly Agree**	**9**
13	1	0	11	57	31	4.17	22.54	83.40	0.38	**Agree**	**10**
6	1	1	10	59	29	4.14	22.95	82.80	0.37	**Agree**	**11**
5	0	3	17	48	32	4.09	19.17	81.80	0.42	**Agree**	**12**
9	2	2	12	56	28	4.06	21.37	81.20	0.37	**Agree**	**13**
16	1	4	23	44	28	3.94	17.21	78.80	0.41	**Agree**	**14**
7	4	3	21	45	27	3.88	16.95	77.60	0.39	**Agree**	**15**
15	5	4	24	38	29	3.82	14.97	76.40	0.41	**Agree**	**16**

We notice from the results of Table (2) above, which represents the answers of the sample members to the questions related to the elements of knowledge, which number (16) questions, where it is clear that questions (1, 2, 4, 12, 14, 16, 11, 3, 8) came strongly agree with averages ranging between (4.71, 4.24) and percentages ranging between (94.2%, 84.8%), and questions (1, 2, 4, 3) represent knowledge diagnosis, while questions (8) are related to knowledge generation, questions (10, 11) are related to knowledge storage, (12) is related to knowledge generation, (14) is related to knowledge application.

Table 3: Likert results regarding the administrative decision

No.	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 I do not know	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree	Average	Deviation	Percentage 100 %	T TEST	Sample direction	Question Rank
17	0	0	5	50	45	4.40	23.46	88.00	0.44	**Strongly Agree**	**17**
36	1	0	3	50	46	4.40	23.79	88.00	0.44	**Strongly Agree**	18
33	0	2	7	41	50	4.39	22.08	87.80	0.47	**Strongly Agree**	19
18	2	0	10	43	45	4.29	20.90	85.80	0.46	**Strongly Agree**	**20**
29	2	1	5	50	42	4.29	22.36	85.80	0.43	**Strongly Agree**	**21**
19	3	0	10	42	45	4.26	20.52	85.20	0.46	**Strongly Agree**	**22**
23	0	0	11	52	37	4.26	21.91	85.20	0.43	**Strongly Agree**	**23**
24	1	0	9	59	31	4.19	23.38	83.80	0.38	**Agree**	**24**
27	1	1	10	54	34	4.19	21.83	83.80	0.40	**Agree**	**25**
40	2	3	4	56	35	4.19	22.80	83.80	0.39	**Agree**	26
20	3	3	7	47	40	4.18	20.42	83.60	0.43	**Agree**	**27**
26	1	1	10	55	33	4.18	22.02	83.60	0.40	**Agree**	**28**
39	3	2	3	58	34	4.18	23.45	83.60	0.37	**Agree**	29

25	2	2	10	51	35	4.15	20.70	83.00	0.41	**Agree**	**30**
30	1	1	15	49	34	4.14	19.97	82.80	0.42	**Agree**	**31**
38	1	1	14	51	33	4.14	20.48	82.80	0.41	**Agree**	32
22	0	2	17	48	33	4.12	19.47	82.40	0.43	**Agree**	**33**
34	2	4	17	34	43	4.12	17.46	82.40	0.48	**Agree**	34
28	3	1	10	54	32	4.11	21.26	82.20	0.39	**Agree**	**35**
37	0	1	14	58	27	4.11	22.36	82.20	0.37	**Agree**	**36**
32	0	1	12	63	24	4.10	24.09	82.00	0.34	**Agree**	**37**
21	0	5	23	34	38	4.05	16.53	81.00	0.47	**Agree**	**38**
35	2	7	18	41	32	3.94	16.11	78.80	0.43	**Agree**	39
31	18	6	20	31	25	3.39	10.73	67.80	0.27	**I do not know**	**40**

We note from the results of Table (3) above, which represents the answers of the sample members to the questions related to the administrative decision, which numbered (24) questions, it is clear that questions (17, 36, 33, 18, 29, 19, 23) came strongly agree with averages ranging between (4.40, 4.26) and percentages ranging between (88%, 85.2%), while questions (24, 27, 40, 20, 26, 34, 25, 30, 38, 22, 34, 28, 37, 32, 21, 35) came agree with averages ranging between (4.19, 3.94) and percentages ranging between (83.8%, 78.8%), while question (31) came neutral with an average of (3.39) and a percentage of (67.8%).

The second direction of analysis relied on the deductive direction by applying the logistic regression analysis technique to build a statistical model that can be used to predict the probability of making a decision. The dependent variable and the independent variables were arranged as follows:

(y) = 1 If the respondent's answer was, in your opinion, do you think that knowledge management has an impact on making administrative decisions, greater than or equal to 50%

(y) = 0 If the respondent's answer was, in your opinion, do you think that knowledge management has an impact on making administrative decisions, less than 50%.

Y = In your opinion, do you think that knowledge management has an impact on administrative decision-making?

And the independent variables (X1,X2,.......,X16) where if the respondent's answer is strongly agree, then the independent variable = 5, and if the respondent's answer is agree, then the value of the independent variable = 4, neutral, the value of the independent variable = 3, disagree, the value of the independent variable = 2, strongly disagree, the value of the independent variable = 1, and for all independent variables, they are as follows:

X1= Support good and creative ideas to develop fair competition

X2= I encourage scientific dialogue among my colleagues to exchange views

X3= I keep my colleagues informed of the new knowledge I gain

X4 = Encourage a culture of individual and collective initiative at work

X5= Adopt mechanisms to receive opinions and suggestions among individuals

X6= Develop a strategic plan for implementing knowledge management and identify the gap between existing knowledge and desired knowledge

X7= Rely on documents and inboxes for knowledge and follow instructions to gain knowledge

X8 = I regularly monitor available and emerging knowledge from various sources and encourage updating of available knowledge

X9 = I work to empower my colleagues to share their accumulated experiences and expertise

X10 = Rely on dialogue and training to retain knowledge and use information technology to store knowledge

X11 = I encourage my colleagues to store knowledge and document the knowledge gained from individuals

X12 = Follow the dialogue method and participate in knowledge circles

X13 = Facilitate all colleagues' access to knowledge bases and participate in training courses

X14 = I help my colleagues apply their knowledge

X15= Management provides knowledge requirements and their applications to employees

X16= The administration provides a network of communication and contact with many departments and scientific research centers to apply knowledge.

3.2. The Results:

After reviewing and tabulating the data, the Statistical Package (SPSS) program was used to analyze the data. To estimating the model parameters, the maximum likelihood method and rotation were adopted, where the optimal estimate of the model parameters was obtained, as the derivative of negative twice the maximum likelihood function, and its lowest value reached at the ninth rotation.

-2Log likelihood = 33.714

Table 4: Iteration History

	Iteration	-2 Log likelihood	Constant	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6	X7	X8	X9	X10	X11	X12	X13	X14	X15	X16
Step 1	1	60.665	-4.276	.186	.594	-.157	.248	.387	.085	.071	.292	-.182	.680	.197	-.016	-.181	-.987	.140	-.071
	2	45.231	-8.136	.211	1.138	.008	.471	.803	.231	.104	.631	-.431	1.382	.215	-.094	-.273	-2.091	.256	-.216
	3	38.385	-13.389	.276	1.824	.335	.647	1.144	.569	.124	1.021	-.667	2.245	.171	-.265	-.386	-3.294	.419	-.431
	4	35.211	-20.443	.424	2.645	.672	.757	1.498	1.020	.066	1.485	-.831	3.225	.219	-.456	-.501	-4.589	.644	-.734
	5	33.973	-27.456	.562	3.417	.929	.827	1.929	1.546	-.110	2.051	-1.000	4.168	.346	-.599	-.557	-5.906	.938	-1.186
	6	33.725	-31.939	.636	3.904	1.043	.859	2.234	1.954	-.260	2.463	-1.142	4.753	.453	-.665	-.562	-6.762	1.162	-1.546
	7	33.714	-33.078	.653	4.023	1.062	.867	2.313	2.068	-.297	2.575	-1.183	4.893	.484	-.680	-.558	-6.975	1.223	-1.642
	8	33.714	-33.138	.654	4.028	1.063	.867	2.317	2.074	-.300	2.582	-1.186	4.900	.485	-.680	-.557	-6.986	1.227	-1.648
	9	33.714	-33.138	.654	4.028	1.063	.867	2.318	2.074	-.300	2.582	-1.186	4.900	.485	-.680	-.557	-6.986	1.227	-1.648

Table No. (5) shows the values of the model parameters, represented by column (B), the standard error (S.E) for each parameter, the Wald statistic, in addition to the significance of the parameters and the logit value:

Table 5: Significant and non-significant variables

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1[a]	X1	.654	.833	.616	1	.432	1.923	.376	9.830
	X2	4.028	1.653	5.941	1	.015	56.169	2.201	1433.230
	X3	1.063	1.046	1.033	1	.309	2.894	.373	22.465
	X4	.867	.774	1.255	1	.263	2.380	.522	10.848
	X5	2.318	1.047	4.897	1	.027	10.150	1.303	79.052
	X6	2.074	1.508	1.892	1	.169	7.960	.414	152.933
	X7	-.300	.815	.135	1	.713	.741	.150	3.662
	X8	2.582	1.495	2.983	1	.084	13.218	.706	247.403
	X9	-1.186	1.022	1.346	1	.246	.305	.041	2.265
	X10	4.900	1.820	7.251	1	.007	134.254	3.794	4750.518

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
	X11	.485	1.058	.210	1	.647	1.625	.204	12.931
	X12	-.680	.773	.775	1	.379	.506	.111	2.303
	X13	-.557	1.432	.151	1	.697	.573	.035	9.480
	X14	-6.986	2.717	6.612	1	.010	.001	.000	.190
	X15	1.227	.849	2.087	1	.149	3.410	.646	18.007
	X16	-1.648	1.340	1.511	1	.219	.192	.014	2.663
	Constant	-33.138	13.607	5.931	1	.015	.000		

To test the efficiency and quality of the model by using the Log Likelihood Ratio, which follows the Chi-square distribution according to the relationship:

$$x^2 = 2[log_e l_0 - log_e l_1]$$

Where the value of ($x^2 = 50.828$) is significant, as shown in Table (6).

Table 6: Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	50.828	16	.000
	Block	50.828	16	.000
	Model	50.828	16	.000

To know the goodness of fit of the model, the Hosmer & Lemshow test was adopted. This test depends on calculating the (x^2) statistic for the difference between the observed values and the expected values. If the (x^2) value is not significant, we accept the null hypothesis (H$_0$), which confirms the quality of the fit for the entire model. Table (7) shows this:

Table 7: Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

Step	Chi-square	df	Sig.
1	1.062	8	.998

Where we notice that the value (x^2) with a degree of freedom (8) and significance (sig= 0.998) confirms the goodness of fit of the model.

To know the strength of the model that was built in the classification of vocabulary, Table (8) shows the classification percentage of the model, and we notice that the percentage of correct classification reached (91.0%), which is an excellent percentage and indicates the strength of the model that was built.

Table 8: Classification

	Observed		Predicted		
			Y		Percentage Correct
			.00	1.00	
Step 1	y	.00	9	6	60.0
		1.00	3	82	96.5
	Overall Percentage				91.0

Referring to Table No. (5) and noting the values in column (B), which contain the model parameters in logit units, the results appearing in the same tables indicate that the independent variables with a significant effect on the dependent variable are:

Log (p/(1-p)) = -33.138 +4.028 X$_2$ +2.318X$_5$+2.582X$_8$+4.900X$_{10}$ - 6.986X$_{14}$

Table 9: The Parameters and Logit Values

β		Exp(B)	
constant	-33.138	0.00	
$_2$β	4.028	56.169	2
$_5$β	2.318	10.150	4
$_8$β	2.582	13.218	3
$_{10}$β	4.900	134.254	1
$_{14}$β	-6.986	0.001	5

We note that the variable (X10) ranked first in influencing the dependent variable (Y), while the variable (X2) ranked second, the variable (X8) ranked third, the variable (X5) ranked fourth, and the variable (X14) ranked fifth. As for the other independent variables (X12, X11, X10, X9, X7, X6, X4, X3, X13, X1, X15, X16), they do not have a significant impact on the dependent variable (Y).

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The most important conclusions and recommendations reached by the research:

1- By applying the Likert scale to the sample's responses' trends and percentages, it appeared that most knowledge management elements and variables had responses' trends in the direction of strongly agree and agree, as well as percentages. As for the decision variables, they also had trends in the direction of strongly agree and agree, and some of them were neutral, as well as percentages.

2- The logistic regression technique can be adopted by building a statistical model through which the role of knowledge management on administrative decisions can be predicted.

3- The independent variables with a significant impact are (according to importance):

X10 = Rely on dialogue and training to retain knowledge and use information technology to store knowledge

X2 = I encourage scientific dialogue among my colleagues to exchange views

X8 = I regularly monitor available and emerging knowledge from various sources and encourage updating of available knowledge

X5 = Adopt mechanisms to receive opinions and suggestions among individuals

X14 = I help my colleagues apply their knowledge.

And the values of the parameters are respectively:
β_{10} =4.900, β_2 =4.028, β_8 =2.582,
β_5 = 2.318, β_{14} = -6.986, β_0 = -33.138

4- The tests proved the significance of the model that was built, as the value (x^2) calculated from the maximum likelihood ratio reached ($x^2 = 50.828$) with a degree of freedom (16), which is significant.

5- The test of the goodness of fit of the model showed a non-significant result, which confirms the absence of significant differences, and confirms the goodness of fit of the model that was built .

6- The percentage of correct classification of the model that was built reached (91.0%), which shows whether knowledge management affects administrative decision-making by 50% or more, or less than 50%.

7- Expanding the use of binary logistic regression represents an effective method for such phenomena.

REFERENCES

1. Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. *MIS quarterly*, 107-136.

2. Al-Haleem Al-Ashi, S. A., & Badi, D. H. (2021). Big Data Analysis from Social Networks as an Enabler for Sustainable Knowledge Management of Marketing Trends. *Journal of Information Studies and Technology, 2021*(2), 8.

3. Abdel Sattar El-Sawy Ahmed, S. (2024). The Effectiveness of Thinking Actively in a Social context (TASC) Model in developing Depth of Historical Knowledge and Curiosity Epistemic Among Secondary school students. *Journal of Faculty of Education-Assiut University*, 40(6), 269-307.

4. Alzawbaee, O. M., & Mahmood, D. O., & Mahmood, A. O. (2022). Developing Logistic Regression Model to Determine the Most Important Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Business Management and Economics Studies, 7*(1) -Nabu Research Academy, 2022.

5. Babichev, S., Lytvynenko, V., Wójcik, W., & Vyshemyrskaya, S. (Eds.). (2020). Lecture Notes in Computational Intelligence and Decision Making: 2020 -International Scientific Conference" Intellectual Systems of Decision-making and Problems of Computational Intelligence" (Vol. 1246). Springer Nature.

6. Bazerman, M. H., & Moore, D. A. (2012). Judgment in managerial decision making. John Wiley & Sons.

7. Fagoyinbo, I. S., Ajibode, I. A., & Olaniran, Y. O. A. (2014). The Application of Logistic Regression Analysis to the Cumulative Grade Point Average of Graduating Students: A Case Study of Students of Applied Science, Federal Polytechnic, Ilaro. *Developing Country Studies, 4*(23), 26-30.

8. Mansour Mubarak Al-Ajmi, N., & Najla. (2023). Proposed mechanisms for school-centered reform in the State of Kuwait. *Journal of the Faculty of Education (Assiut), 39*(10), 218-248.

9. Mishaal Al-Mishaan, A., & Mukhtar Ashkanani, P. (2023). The reality of financial funding in Kuwaiti universities and its relationship to administrative decision-making from the point of view of university employees. *Journal of the Faculty of Education (Assiut), 39*(2.2), 180-205.

10. Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation. Oxford university press.

11. Qashqari, S., & Mansouri, K. (2020). The role of knowledge management in.

12. Turpin, S. M., & Marais, M. A. (2004). Decision-making: Theory and [12]- practice. *ORiON, 20*(2), 143-160.

13. Yamasaki, H., & Yamada, I. (2000, August). Revolution of knowledge creating companies in Japan. In Proceedings of the 2000 IEEE Engineering Management Society. EMS-2000 (Cat. No. 00CH37139) (pp. 630-636). IEEE.

14. Zamzam Yass Abu Issa Ahmed. (2019). The Role of Knowledge Management in the Performance of the

Sudanese Free Zones and Markets Company 2013-2018 (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nilein).

15. Zidane, A. A. (2024). Intelligent Content Management Systems: Systematic.

Cite This Article: Obaid Mahmmood Mohsin Al Zawbaee, Hamdi Ismail Ahmad, Hamid Jihad Dulaimi Alkubaisi (2025). The Role of knowledge Management in Making Administrative Decisions. *East African Scholars J Econ Bus Manag, 8*(3), 97-105.